



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1400  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/628,884

07/28/2003

Marc J. Shlacs

23688/04164

3865

24024

7590

10/31/2006

CALFEE HALTER & GRISWOLD, LLP  
800 SUPERIOR AVENUE  
SUITE 1400  
CLEVELAND, OH 44114

EXAMINER

ALI, MOHAMMAD

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2166

DATE MAILED: 10/31/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/628,884

Applicant(s)

SHLAES ET AL.

Examiner

Mohammad Ali

Art Unit

2166

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 31 July 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 3-19 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 3-19 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 4/12/04, 4/16/04.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. Applicant's election of Group I (claims 1-19) in the reply filed on 7/31/06 is acknowledged.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101***

2. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 7-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because it does not produce any tangible result in the real world (i.e., an abstract idea, natural phenomenon, or law of nature) and is not directed to a practical application of such judicial exception (e.g., because the claim does not require any physical transformation and the invention as claimed does not produce a useful, concrete, and tangible result), see MPEP about the 101, 706.03(a) and others.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein

Art Unit: 2166

were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

4. Claims 1, 3-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Arun K. Gupta (hereinafter "Gupata"), USP, 6,853,994 in view of Biebesheimer et al. (hereinafter "Biebesheimer") USP, 6,643,639.

With respect to claim 1,

Gupta teaches a system for unifying data relating to an industry having a plurality of industry business context dimensions which define logical groupings of data related to the industry (see col. 21, lines 1-19, Fig. 23), the system comprising:

a plurality of data sources, at least one data source having a physical or logical structure differing from at least one other data source, each data source having data which is capable of a logical contextual grouping into at least one data source specific dimension which contains data related to at least one industry business context dimension, and each data source having a data access mechanism for facilitating querying thereof (see col. 18, lines 5-18 and col. 21, lines 26-35, Fig. 15, Gupta);

a database having a first and a second plurality of nodes (see Fig. 15, Gupta), each of the first plurality of nodes representing an industry business context dimension, each of the second plurality of nodes representing a data source specific dimension of

at least one of the data sources, each of the first plurality of nodes related to at least one other of the first plurality of nodes, and each of the second plurality of nodes related to at least one of the first plurality of nodes (see col. 22, lines 1-15, Gupta); and

a plurality of data source query function calls, each query function call querying a single data source regarding a single data source specific dimension, and each query function call using the data access mechanism of the single data source to facilitate access to the single data source (see col. 15, lines 51-63, Fig. 10a, Gupta).

Gupta does not explicitly indicate claimed access mechanism for facilitating query.

Biebesheimer teaches claimed access mechanism for facilitating query (multi-dimensional data for expressing query and results that enables users to completely manage their search in a manner optimized for simplicity and clarity of logic; and, the graphical user interface is directed to a Results Display Workspace that enables expression of relevance of results in terms of user context in a manner optimized to facilitate resource selection using user supplied decision criteria, see col. 5, lines 40-48, Biebesheimer).

It would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the data processing art at the time of the present invention to combine the teachings of the cited references because access mechanism for facilitating query of Biebesheimer's teaching would have allowed Gupta's system provides a response set based on user queries and derived user contexts and that is adaptable for modifying output response sets in accordance

with different user contexts and user interactions as they change over time as suggested by Biebesheimer at col. 1, lines 11-15.

As to claim 3,

Gupta teaches wherein each dimension has at least one dimension instance, the system further comprising: at least one result set object populated by data returned from a query from a user, wherein the query from the user includes selection of at least one dimension instance and at least one query function call without identification by the user of which data source to query (see col. 18, lines 5-18 and col. 21, lines 26-35, col. 5, lines 55-65, Fig. 15, Gupta).

As to claim 4,

Gupta teaches at least one complex query calling a plurality of query function calls to query the plurality of data sources, wherein the one complex query does not identify any data source to query (see col. 18, lines 5-18 and col. 21, lines 26-35, Fig. 15, Gupta).

As to claim 5,

Gupta teaches at least one complex query for data located in a plurality of data sources, the complex query calling a plurality of query function calls to query the plurality of data sources for the data, the complex query having a set of input parameters which define the data to be queried for, the set of input parameters consisting of at least one dimension instance, a query result and a description of the data to be queried (see col. 18, lines 5-18 and col. 21, lines 26-35, col. 5, lines 55-65, Fig. 15, Gupta).

As to claim 6,

Gupta teaches wherein the description of the data to be queried is an exact\_request\_for\_information (see col. 21, lines 26-35, col. 5, lines 55-65, Fig. 15, Gupta).

With respect to claim 7,

Gupta teaches a system for managing data relating to an industry having a plurality of industry business context dimensions which define logical groupings of data related to the industry, the data contained in a plurality of data sources, at least one data source having a physical or logical structure differing from at least one other data source, each data source having data which is capable of a logical contextual grouping into at least one data source specific dimension which contains data related to at least one industry business context dimension, and each data source having a data access mechanism for facilitating querying thereof (see col. 18, lines 5-18 and col. 21, lines 26-35, Fig. 15, Gupta), the system comprising: a UniDimNet and a plurality of UniViews. Gupta does not explicitly indicate claimed access mechanism for facilitating query.

Biebesheimer teaches claimed access mechanism for facilitating query (multi-dimensional data for expressing query and results that enables users to completely manage their search in a manner optimized for simplicity and clarity of logic; and, the graphical user interface is directed to a Results Display Workspace that enables expression of relevance of results in terms of user context in a manner optimized to

Art Unit: 2166

facilitate resource selection using user supplied decision criteria, see col. 5, lines 40-48, Biebesheimer).

It would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the data processing art at the time of the present invention to combine the teachings of the cited references because access mechanism for facilitating query of Biebesheimer's teaching would have allowed Gupta's system provides a response set based on user queries and derived user contexts and that is adaptable for modifying output response sets in accordance with different user contexts and user interactions as they change over time as suggested by Biebesheimer at col. 1, lines 11-15.

As to claim 8,

Gupta teaches wherein the UniDimNet further comprises: a plurality of UniDims, each UniDim representing an industry business context dimension, each UniDim related to at least one other UniDim; and a plurality of DataSourceDims, each DataSourceDim representing a data source specific dimension of a data source, and each DataSourceDim related to at least one UniDim (see col. 18, lines 5-18 and col. 21, lines 26-35, Fig. 15, Gupta).

As to claim 9,

Gupta teaches wherein each UniDim and each DataSourceDim is a node in a network which is contained in a database (see col. 21, lines 26-35, col. 5, lines 55-65, Fig. 15, Gupta).

As to claim 10,

Gupta teaches wherein each node is a table (see col. 22, lines 1-15, Gupta).



As to claim 11,

Gupta teaches wherein each dimension has at least one dimension instance, and each dimension instance has a unique identification, wherein: each UniDim table contains the unique identification of each dimension instance of the dimension to which the UniDim relates (see col. 21, lines 26-35, col. 5, lines 55-65, Fig. 15, Gupta).

As to claim 12,

Gupta teaches wherein each UniView is a query function call which queries a single data source regarding a single data source specific dimension by using the data access mechanism of the data source.

As to claim 13,

Gupta teaches at least one complex query (see col. 22, lines 1-15, Gupta).

As to claim 14,

Gupta teaches the complex query having a set of input parameters, the set of input parameters not identifying a data source (see col. 18, lines 5-18 and col. 21, lines 26-35, col. 5, lines 55-65, Fig. 15, Gupta).

As to claim 15,

Gupta teaches a UniViewer (see col. 22, lines 1-15, Gupta).

Claims 16-19 have the same subject matter as of claims 1, 3-14 and essentially rejected for the same reasons as discussed above.

***Allowable Subject Matter***

5. Claim 2 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

**Contact Information**

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mohammad Ali whose telephone number is (571) 272-4105. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday (7:30 am-6:00 pm).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Hosain T. Alam can be reached on (571) 272-3978. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

  
Mohammad Ali  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 2166

MA  
October 30, 2006